

I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that, whether it is these 750,000-plus DREAMers, these young Americans who, at a very tender age, were brought to this country by their parents or relatives and in every single way, except for citizenship, are no different than my three children or anyone else that I represent in the great City of El Paso, Texas—these DREAMers are going to high school, are serving in our Armed Forces, are attending our universities, are, in many respects, the future of our communities, of our country, who have so much to gain personally and so much to give back to this country. These DREAMers must be spared from any decisions that would break the trust that was created with them, that would force them back to their countries of origin, which they no longer know as home, whose language they no longer speak, where they no longer have family with whom they can reside.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important, on the larger subject of how we talk about those who are in our country from another country, that we remember a few facts. For example, the border that connects us with our country and neighbor to the south, Mexico, is as safe today as it has ever been. The community that I have the honor to represent and to serve, El Paso, Texas, which is conjoined with Ciudad Juarez to form the largest binational community anywhere in the world, is the safest city in the United States. It is safe not in spite of, but precisely because of, our connection to Mexico, the Mexican immigrants, the Mexican Americans, and those who are in our community, documented or otherwise, that make El Paso such a tremendously safe, wonderful, thriving community.

We know that U.S. cities on the border with Mexico and U.S. cities with large immigrant populations are, in fact, far safer than the average U.S. city in the interior, be that in Kentucky, be that in Iowa. That is what we have to be proud of. That is what we need to share with the American public.

We also need them to know that immigrants, documented or otherwise—and including, especially, those who are undocumented—commit crimes, including violent crimes, at a far lower rate than do native-born U.S. citizens.

We need to remember that we have so much to be proud of, so much to be grateful for, so much to celebrate in the immigrants' story, especially these DREAMers who, right now, live in a period of uncertainty, fear, and anxiety. It is incumbent upon us in this Chamber to do what we must to change our laws to reflect our values and the reality in our communities and in our country. Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to work with any Member on either side of the aisle to do just that.

I want to thank my colleagues who joined me tonight to help drive home the very important point that everyone who is in our country that has registered with the government, that has come forward, that has applied successfully under the DACA program deserves to stay here and deserves our help to ensure our laws allow them to do that going forward.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague Mr. O'ROURKE for his work to highlight such an important issue.

Since November 9th, many of the immigrants in my district of Dallas-Fort Worth have been rightfully nervous about their future in the United States.

It is no secret where the President-Elect stands on immigration.

He has vowed to repeal the highly successful Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, commonly known as DACA.

This move is wrong for America and for the immigrants whose lives have been forever changed by the program.

Since 2012, over 135,000 bright young Texans have successfully applied for the program.

It has been life changing for all those who qualified.

This has been especially true for one of my constituents, Erik.

Erik is a 27-year-old DACA recipient who immigrated to the United States from Mexico with his mother when he was just two years old.

Erik was unaware of his immigration status for the majority of his life until he reached a critical milestone at the age of 16.

When he asked his mother if he could apply for his driver's license, what normally would be an exciting event turned into a difficult conversation with his mother about his immigration status.

Erik was devastated because although he called the United States home, he would be unable to move forward with his life as he planned.

Once he graduated from high school, Erik knew that attending college would be a significant challenge—one he almost didn't take on.

He shared that he wasn't even sure college was the right decision because he was unsure that he could get a job after he graduated.

Yet, he persevered and graduated in 2011—but once again was confronted with the reality that his undocumented status created additional challenges.

Although he was college educated, Erik couldn't legally work in the United States.

But with the announcement of DACA in 2012, Erik had a ray of hope.

Finally, Erik could legally work and better participate in the country he's called home since the age of two.

Since successfully receiving DACA status, Erik has worked as a Store Systems Engineer at Rent-A-Car and has advocated for other undocumented immigrants.

Unfortunately, the newly found freedom Erik enjoyed under DACA is now in jeopardy.

Now, with just weeks away until the President-Elect is sworn into office, millions of DREAMers are frightened they will be forced to return to the shadows or be targeted for deportation.

These young aspiring immigrants are already part of our communities.

They attend our schools, work alongside us, and live in our neighborhoods.

For Erik and the thousands of other DREAMers across Texas, the revocation of DACA could mean returning to countries they haven't called home since they were children.

While we work to reform our broken immigration system, we must remember that the immigrants we speak of are just like us—they have hopes, dreams, and want to live a good life.

Like Erik, I believe that we need to move forward with immigration reform.

I believe we can do so in a way that keeps families together and benefits our country as a whole at the same time.

I stand here alongside my colleagues to remind our country's DREAMers that the fight isn't over.

Our fight here in Congress has just begun.

PROTESTS OF THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the rule of law, the importance of enforcement of the rule of law, the importance of a government that stands for law and order.

I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, as I begin my comments tonight by reading a resolution of support, a resolution that illustrates the position of a very important organization in my State of North Dakota, the North Dakota Veterans Coordinating Council.

□ 2000

It reads like this:

Whereas: The protests against the Dakota Access Pipeline have been going on for over 100 days in North Dakota.

Whereas: The protests have been conducted on public and private land without proper permission.

Whereas: The protests have not remained peaceful. In fact, the protesters have caused millions of dollars in damage. They have destroyed public and privately owned property, vehicles, and equipment to include heavy equipment and trucks owned by private contractors, at least two government trucks, cut privately owned fences, and slaughtered farm animals owned by private farms. Protesters have assaulted and thrown Molotov cocktails and hard objects at North Dakota law enforcement officers and military personnel who are sworn to keep the peace and protect North Dakota's citizens.

Whereas: Protesters have desecrated North Dakota State and Federal property, to include the North Dakota State Capitol and, yes, the North Dakota pillar of the World War II Monument right here in Washington, D.C., located at The National Mall.

Whereas: The protesters of the Dakota Access Pipeline in and around Standing Rock have desecrated the American flag by flying it upside down, sewing emblems over the flag, and displaying emblems and non-U.S. flags in a dominant manner to the U.S. flag in violation of North Dakota Century Code.

Whereas: 95 percent of the protesters are not North Dakota citizens or Native Americans. Many are professional paid protesters

unaware of the true understanding of the issues at hand.

Whereas: As former military members, we have all taken an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against foreign and domestic enemies, the American flag, and our freedom. As veterans, we continue to support our military, law enforcement, and all of our constitutional rights we have fought for.

Whereas: As veterans of the U.S. military, we have fought for and maintained the rights of our citizens to peacefully protest. The protests in Standing Rock have not been peaceful and, therefore, violate the rights of those living peacefully around the protest site and threaten the sanctity and sustainability of our basic freedom of peaceful protests by crossing the line into unlawful activities.

Whereas: Individual veterans and veteran groups from outside of the State of North Dakota have reached out to North Dakota veterans and veterans service organizations for support in their plan to recruit veterans to assemble in North Dakota in support of the Standing Rock protest against the Dakota Access Pipeline.

Whereas: Veterans standing in a nonpeaceful protest against the Dakota Access Pipeline, will also be standing against North Dakota law enforcement, military, private and government entities, reflects poorly upon themselves, our veterans organizations, veterans as a whole, the State of North Dakota, and our country.

Therefore: Let it be the position of the North Dakota Veterans Coordinating Council made up of the North Dakota AMVETS, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Vietnam Veterans of America adamantly oppose and condemn any veteran organization or persons representing themselves as U.S. military veterans who associate or involve themselves with the illegal activities which have occurred or take part in any unlawful or unbecoming conduct or assembly in protest to the Dakota Access Pipeline in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I could never say it better than the men and women who have fought and who have been willing to die for our liberties. They have said it perfectly in this position in support of a legally permitted pipeline and in support of our law enforcement officers who have exercised tremendous restraint against violence thrown at them. I, for one, am tired, as are the vast majority of North Dakotans, of people from outside of our State with a political agenda who have co-opted the reasonable, peaceful protests that once began what has become a full-fledged riot.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 months, thousands of rioters disguising themselves as prayerful people, peaceful protesters, have illegally camped on Federal land owned or at least managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, owned by the taxpayers of this country. They have illegally camped on the shores of the Missouri River.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, if you and I decided to go for a walk on that same land and picked up a rock and threw it in the river, we would be fined by this government. But, oh, no, not antifossil fuel rioters. No, they are enabled; no, they are encouraged by our Federal Government, at least this current Administration.

Celebrities, bad actors; celebrities, political activists; and anti-oil extremists are blocking this pipeline's progress, and they are doing so based not on good information, not on the law, but rather on a leftwing political agenda. Oh, by the way, these celebrities and these rioters fly in on jet airplanes that are fueled by jet fuel that is refined from oil, in many cases Bakken oil; but let's ignore the irony and the hypocrisy for the moment.

North Dakotans like these veterans that I just read about have respected the rights of peaceful protesters, but this has gone way beyond that. It has become rioting, plain and simple. In fact, I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that two Federal courts right here in the District of Columbia have upheld the legality of this pipeline. First, a D.C. Circuit district judge appointed by President Obama, I might add, denied a request for an injunction to stop this pipeline based on the fact that not only has the company and the Corps of Engineers and the North Dakota Public Service Commission met every letter of the law, but exceeded it, including, according to this judge's own opinion, exceeding the requirements for consultation with the sovereign tribes. The project developer and the Army Corps tried desperately to engage the Standing Rock Sioux tribe dozens of times, only to be rejected for more than 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, all that remains for the pipeline to be finished is an easement to begin the process and to finish the process of connecting this pipeline under the Missouri River in North Dakota, an easement that has been prepared and finished for months. Of course, the Obama administration rescinded a permit that had already been issued, a 408 permit to allow the pipeline to be built under this river. The same administration, by the way, who has gone to court to defend it. It is ironic, to say the least. It is chaos, to say the best.

At the center of this issue is an administration that refuses—not just refuses to follow the rule of law, but enables and encourages the breaking of the law, beginning with the fact that thousands of illegal protesters are allowed to camp, to trespass on federally owned land.

Now, if you allow somebody to illegally assemble, why would they not think that they should be allowed to burn property? Why would they not think they should be allowed to trespass on private land? Why would they think they shouldn't be allowed to throw Molotov cocktails at police officers trying to protect innocent citizens? Why would they not think they could follow a police officer home and harass his family until they had to move out of their home, or follow a National Guard member to their apartment and then harass them at their apartment and force their family to leave, to spit on them? Why would they think they shouldn't be allowed to do

that if the President of the United States says go ahead and trespass?

Never mind that this is a legally permitted pipeline. Let's just ignore that. Let's withdraw the permit that we have already issued, that we are defending in court. Why wouldn't they think that?

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to virtue in this country?

When I see these protesters, rioters, criminals, thugs—yes, thugs; it is not a racial comment; it is just what you call people who are thugs—I look at them and I think, who is their mother? Where were they raised? How were they raised?

What has happened in this country when we stand here in this Chamber, in this assembly, in this town, and we hear some people, politicians, supposed leaders, talk about law enforcement as though they are the problem? What has happened that people have become confused about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing the law?

It is hard for North Dakotans to see that because we are not confused by that. We were raised by parents who told us what was right and what was wrong, who taught us to respect the legal system, to respect law enforcement officers. We have really respectable police officers in North Dakota, and we do throughout this country, because we have seen them come from multiple States. The National Sheriffs' Association has sent many officers. Other States and city police departments and counties have sent law enforcement officers to give some assistance to our overworked, overtaxed law enforcement officers right in North Dakota. We are tired of it.

Stay home, Jane Fonda; don't come back and deliver food, pretend that somehow you care and take off again in your private jet; unless you want to try to fly that jet on solar panels, then come on, we will take you.

You can't encourage illegal behavior and then wonder why there is violence, Mr. Speaker; and that is what our President has done.

Let's give a little background on this. I know a little bit about siting pipelines. I was a regulator for nearly 10 years. I have sited several of them. This 1,172-mile Dakota Access Pipeline will deliver as many as 570,000 barrels of Bakken crude oil every day to Patoeka, Illinois, and then to other markets beyond. This is 570,000 barrels of oil that is currently being produced every single day. It is being transported now. It will always find its way to market. It is just that it is being transported by trains and trucks. Oh, those aren't as safe or as efficient or even as environmentally friendly ways to move oil as a safe pipeline is, especially one that is going to be buried 100 feet below the bottom of the river, to make sure that the water is safe.

From the outset of this process, the Standing Rock Sioux leaders have refused to sit down and meet with either

the Corps of Engineers or the pipeline developer. However, 55 other tribes have. The Corps consulted with 55 Native American tribes at least 389 times, after which they proposed 140 variations of the current route to avoid culturally sensitive areas in North Dakota alone.

That is right, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to read about that in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*. You are never going to hear about it on NBC or ABC or CBS. You may not even hear about it in North Dakota because, frankly, even our media are afraid of the ramifications of violent rioters who are willing to commit violent acts if you cross them. Yes, even my home address has been posted on their Web sites and on their Facebook pages so that they know where my family and I live. These are the prayerful, peaceful protesters you hear so much about on the NBC News.

This project route was examined, reviewed, studied, and ultimately supported by the North Dakota Public Service Commission, the State Historic Preservation Office, assorted tribal consultants from around the country, and multiple professional independent archaeologists. This is a thoroughly vetted pipeline, which is why it has over 200 Federal permits, all of which have been delivered and have been built, except for this one, which was rescinded to make a political statement.

They say that they object to the pipeline being close to the water intake of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. However, it shouldn't be of any concern. As I said, this is going to go between 90 and 115 feet below the floor of the river. It is double-lined pipe. It has got control valves at both ends and sensors at both ends. It is the safest pipeline in the world.

By the way, the intake for Standing Rock's drinking water, the new one, which will be in service before the end of this year, is 70 miles away. There is a railroad track that carries hundreds of thousands of barrels every day over the top of the Missouri, as close as that.

By the way, the other thing you often hear is that this was not the original route, that there were other preferred routes, but because they crossed at places that affected a different kind of people than the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, that this was somehow discriminatory.

Let me set that record straight as well. I know, as I said, a fair bit about pipelines. I have read the permit. I have read the application. I have read the judge's opinions. It was always planned for this location for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker. By the way, there are at least 10 to 12 other petroleum pipelines north of this same location. This is just going to be the latest and greatest of them. The main reason this route was chosen was because it was the least intrusive on the environment, on waterways, on private property, and on cultural resources.

□ 2015

The other locations that were under consideration that were not chosen crossed many more bodies of water and were much closer to many wells and cultural resources and very important historical resources. It was 48 extra miles of previously undisturbed field areas. This is and was the best route because it is an existing corridor. In this same corridor, there is already a natural gas pipeline. There is already a large electric transmission line. That is why it was chosen.

Let me talk a little bit about the impact this is having on my State. We had the recent vandalism of the graves in Bismark. That is right. They vandalized graves in a Bismark cemetery. Of course, the unconscionable graffiti markings on the North Dakota World War II pillar that the veterans wrote about earlier are examples of how these peaceful protestors' actions don't match their claims.

The responsibility of protecting property and residents has fallen on the shoulders of the State of North Dakota because, guess what, when we asked the Obama administration for law enforcement help, for reimbursement, at least, for our State and for our counties for a situation that they created by their refusal to obey the law themselves, they sent some PR people from the Department of Justice. They sent people to watch our cops to make sure they don't do something wrong. See, again, they are confused about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing the law. We are not confused about that in North Dakota.

Attempts to get reimbursement or to get U.S. Federal help have fallen on deaf ears. So far, North Dakota has had to borrow \$17 million to cover law enforcement costs. I will tell you this—and we have heard in the Chamber a lot of bad-mouthing of the incoming administration—I can't wait. I can't wait to go to Attorney General JEFF SESSIONS and explain the situation to him and ask him for assistance. I am very encouraged by President-elect Trump's favorable comments about the Dakota Access Pipeline earlier today.

These protesters, these demonstrators, these rioters have brought protests into the communities of Bismark and Mandan. They blocked roads and traffic, forcing lock-downs at the State capital and Federal buildings. They have forced people to leave their homes. They forced daycare centers to close. This daycare was forced into lockdown twice. Can you imagine explaining to children, who don't know anything about a pipeline and they don't care—and they shouldn't have to—why they are in a lockdown, why they have to be careful. Some out-of-State thugs are circling the block, harassing the owners.

Many of our residents are fearful for the safety of their neighborhoods and volunteers are hesitant even to deliver Meals on Wheels. We have had people call us and say they can't deliver Meals

on Wheels because people won't even answer their doors because they have seen these rioters walking around their property.

Law enforcement and their families have been stopped and rioters have repeatedly tried to intimidate them. On Thanksgiving Day, 300 protesters blocked traffic in Mandan, North Dakota, carrying a large dead pig on a stick while at least as many protesters, again, trespassed and built a bridge to reach a hilltop on private property.

Law enforcement has shown tremendous constraint, giving verbal warnings that if they stop making the bridge, there would not be any arrests. It was ignored. The bridge was built. Rioters crossed, dismantled the bridge, and law enforcement held the line for hours against tremendous numbers—they were well outnumbered—without a single arrest.

The protesters are the clear agitators and the criminals here, not the police officers. There would be no law enforcement presence if these protests were truly peaceful.

For example, most media have demonized their law enforcement for use of water as a less than lethal tool during a protest in cold temperatures. They used it to hold back protestors only after they used the water to put out prairie fires that were started by the protesters. And the protestors got wet from a water cannon. By the way, that is a made-up term by the national media to make it sound like some sort of violent act by our police department. It was a water hose brought there to put out fires. And when they used that to push back hundreds of protesters when there were only dozens of police officers, now they are blamed for being the agitators.

As you can tell, I am frustrated, Mr. Speaker. I am frustrated not just by the actions of these thugs, because we have come to expect that from certain people in this country, unfortunately. I am frustrated by this administration's refusal to obey the law, to enforce the law, to support the law, but instead enable and actually encourage the breaking of the law. That is not what we elect the President for. I am so grateful we have a law-and-order President coming into office shortly.

They have been forced to arrest more than 400 people, most of them from out of State. They get bailed out rather quickly. Somehow they have a source of lots of money readily available to bail people out and cover their expenses. They have chained themselves to equipment to prevent work from being done.

Here is an interesting fact. When it was much warmer in North Dakota than it is today, they would chain themselves to the equipment. And then, after hours of being there, they would get thirsty. And police officers, rather than just letting them stay there, actually helped provide them water and held the water so that the protesters, the illegal rioters, could get

a drink of water. That is the quality of our law enforcement officers.

They burned tires and fields, as I said earlier. They damaged cars and bridges. They harassed residents and have torn down fences. They killed and slaughtered neighbors' cattle and bison and horses. There was at least one report where gunshots were fired at the police.

By the way, this protest is not about climate. We hear about that. By the way, it shouldn't have anything to do with climate. The oil is being produced. Now the issue is: How do you transport it? Do you transport it in the most environmentally and economical and efficient way in a pipeline? Or, do you transport it in some less safe, less efficient, less environmentally friendly way?

The simple fact is, our Nation will continue to produce and consume oil, and pipelines are the best way to move that oil. Legally permitting infrastructure projects have to be allowed to proceed without the threat of improper governmental meddling and activity.

By the way, what of shovel-ready jobs, Mr. Speaker? What of that? What of building the infrastructure of this country with private sector money? What a great thing. But for the Bakken and other shale oil plays in this country in the last 8 years, we still would be in a recession. Most of the jobs that have been created in the last 8 years in this country have been created in the energy sector.

It is not about water protection, as I said. There is a brand new intake system being built. It will be operational 73 miles from this pipeline. That is not the issue. That is just an excuse. By the way, that new intake is about 1.6 miles downstream of a railroad track, a railroad bridge that will carry crude oil, as well.

The pipeline is not going to come in contact with the water. It employs the latest and greatest in advanced technology. As I said, a dozen or more oil and gas and refined product pipelines already cross the Missouri River upstream from the tribe's drinking water intake, and this pipeline is crossing at a point where there is existing infrastructure. It is an infrastructure corridor.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of law matters. I am so grateful for our law enforcement officers, as I said, not just in Morton County, not just around Bismark, Mandan, and not just in North Dakota, but from around the country who have come to the assistance of our State. But, Mr. Speaker, if we think we are going to rebuild the infrastructure of this country, and every time we build a railroad track or a highway or a bridge or a pipeline or a transmission line or wind farm or factory, we are going to have to put up with this, what kind of investment is going to take place in this country?

As I said, we are not confused in North Dakota about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing

the law. The vast majority of North Dakotans—and when I say vast, well into 90 percent—support law enforcement. We are grateful for what they do. We are sorry that you are going through this.

I will fight with everything I have and use every ounce of influence I have over the next administration and with my colleagues in this Chamber to provide the resources to make sure that you get a day off, to make sure that our State gets reimbursed, and that your families are compensated for what you have gone through.

I thank law enforcement officers for taking and making the tremendous sacrifice they make to protect legal commerce, peaceful citizens, and yes, ironically, Mr. Speaker, I thank the law enforcement officers for protecting the right to express ourselves in a peaceful manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EVENTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to be recognized to address the floor of the United States House of Representatives. It was quite interesting to listen to the gentleman from North Dakota and the stress that they have up there; in particular, with regard to the pipeline being built through there.

I would just want to reinforce the statements made by the gentleman from North Dakota and point out that the permits are there, the process is there. We have tens of thousands of miles of pipelines in the United States of America, and we have very, very few problems with leaks or other circumstances that would cause one to think that there is a safer way to transport oil. There is not. The safest way is with the pipeline.

I am one who has actually started out in the construction business building pipelines. We have been in the construction business for 42 years. We dig in the ground, and we are doing underground utility work every day, except for Sundays, and we go deep sometimes. We go into hydraulic soil from time to time. Water tables are above where we are working. We do well points. We are working with the flow of water in the soil and underground, and we have got a good look at this as anybody I know.

I would point out to those that are detractors that say: well, we can pollute the underground aquifer if we have a pipeline that we build and if that pipeline should leak. And I would point out something that they ought to know if they ever saw a movie of a shipwreck: oil floats on water. Therefore, it cannot penetrate down into the aquifer. You are not pumping off of the top-

skimmed surface of the aquifer. You are pumping down below. And if you should get a leak, which is extraordinarily rare, the oil pools and floats on the top and can be pumped off.

There is no safer way to transfer petroleum products and no more efficient way. It is by far the best way, which is why we have tens of thousands of pipelines all over this country moving all kinds of product, including crude oil, but also anhydrous ammonia and a number of other products across the country.

I have built the pipelines. I have been down in the trench. I have been tossed into the air and slammed to the ground and climbed down the machine. The wind, the dust, the noise, the heat, the cold, has all been around me. What I don't understand is why anybody would take people seriously that think that oil doesn't float on water, or that there is a better way to transport oil, or that somehow if they just get organized and people fund them, we are going to pay attention to them as if they were logical. They are not.

So that concludes my statement on the oil pipeline. I am hopeful, though, that in the upcoming Trump administration the future Secretary of State signs that permit that opens up that they need one section of pipe to go across the 49th parallel, Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the Keystone XL pipeline. We can build that pipeline down to the Canadian border from the north, and we can build the pipeline up to the Canadian border from the south. But what has always been short on the Obama administration is a Hillary Clinton or a John Kerry signature on the document that says: we have an agreement with Canada to connect these pipelines together at our border. That is one section of pipe that would need to go in there.

I believe that happens under the Trump administration. And we should set aside these ridiculous arguments earlier rather than later. But America looks ridiculous in the world if we are going to argue against that very logic that, if petroleum needs to move and we are going to use it to move product around America and heat our homes and generate electricity and all the things that we do, then we need to do it as effectively and efficiently as possible or we will become noncompetitive for the rest of the country.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize the points made by the gentleman from North Dakota, and I urge that the Corps of Engineers accelerate the operation up there, and they can commence to finish their work that goes across what is the reservoir and river, the Missouri River, get that connected and get it done. This demonstration isn't going to be over till you get done, so bore on through would be my advice.

THE DEATH OF FIDEL CASTRO

Mr. KING of Iowa. I made myself a promise yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when